

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DANIEL PAUL SAGER,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 17-12893

HON. GEORGE CARAM STEEH

EQUIFAX INFORMATION  
SERVICES LLC,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

ORDER REQUESTING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
FROM PLAINTIFF IN REGARDS TO HIS MOTION  
TO EXTEND TIME TO CONDUCT DISCOVERY (DOC. 9)

On December 11, 2017, the Court entered a scheduling order, (Doc. 6), specifying a discovery cutoff date of April 13, 2018, and a dispositive motion due date of May 14, 2018. (Doc. 6 at PageID 18). On May 14, 2018, defendant filed a motion for summary judgment. (Doc. 7). In response, plaintiff filed a motion to extend time to conduct discovery. (Doc. 9). Plaintiff claims that he never engaged in discovery because he was waiting for the Court to schedule a Rule 16 Conference. Plaintiff asks the Court to reopen discovery for 60 days.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(d) governs situations where facts are unavailable to the nonmovant of a motion for summary judgment.

If a nonmovant shows by affidavit or declaration that, for specified reasons, it cannot present facts essential to justify its opposition, the court may:

- (1) defer considering the motion or deny it;
- (2) allow time to obtain affidavits or declarations or to take discovery; or
- (3) issue any other appropriate order.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(d).

Plaintiff did not include any affidavit or declaration in his motion to extend time to conduct discovery. The Court therefore requests that plaintiff file such documents by June 15, 2018. The Court shall then review the documents and rule on plaintiff's motion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 1, 2018

s/George Caram Steeh  
GEORGE CARAM STEEH  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served upon attorneys of record on June 1, 2018, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Marcia Beauchemin  
Deputy Clerk